Summary

SUMMARY

S.1 Project Synopsis

Project Location

The proposed Montecito Ranch Project (hereinafter referred to as "Proposed Project" or "Project") is located in the unincorporated community of Ramona in the County of San Diego approximately 20 miles northeast of the City of San Diego. The Project site is approximately one mile northwest of the Ramona Town Center. State Route 78 (SR 78) borders the northern Project site boundary, while Montecito Way stems from the southern Project site boundary. The Project site includes the Montecito Ranch Specific Planning Area (SPA), two areas adjacent to the SPA boundary (one northwest, the other northeast), and associated off-site roadway and utilities improvements. Immediate surrounding land uses consist of semi-rural and estate residential development to the north, east, and south. The Lemurian Fellowship is a residential/religious use with various facilities to the immediate northwest. The 1,027-acre Davis SPA adjoins the Project site on the west and consists of pasturelands with limited development. This property was recently purchased by The Nature Conservancy for preservation. The Ramona Airport lies approximately 0.5 mile south of the Project site.

Project Description

The Proposed Project would include the development of a rural residential community consisting of 417 single-family residential units, in addition to associated public facilities and infrastructure improvements. The Proposed Project application includes a Specific Plan (SP 01-001), a General Plan Amendment (GPA 04-013), a Rezone (R 04-022), a Tentative Map (TM 5250), and two Major Use Permits (P 04-045). A Major Use Permit also would be prepared and submitted for a water reclamation facility (WRF; see discussion below) if that is the sewage treatment option selected by the County Board of Supervisors.

The paramount objective of the Project is to create an environmentally sensitive residential community compatible with the rural character of the surrounding area. The proposed homes would be consolidated within the eastern half of the SPA on lot sizes ranging from approximately 0.5 acre (20,000 square feet [s.f.] minimum) to 1.8 acres. A total of up to 573.8 acres of the Project site would be dedicated as open space, of which approximately 220.5 acres have been set aside as mitigation for past farming activities on site. (Wherever the open space acreage is referenced in this Environmental Impact Report [EIR], it includes these set-aside 220.5 acres.) The Project site is divided into two units. All open space in Units 1 and 2 would be dedicated upon completion of Unit 1. The dedicated open space areas would include steep slopes, sensitive biological habitat, important archaeological resources, buffer areas, and other environmentally sensitive areas to create viable wildlife corridors and linkages.

The Proposed Project would be phased relative to the two separate units noted above, although grading/construction could simultaneously be occurring in both units at once. Unit 1 would include 244 single-family residences within five neighborhoods, and Unit 2 would include 173 residences, within three neighborhoods. Lots 1 through 30 in Unit 1 would be allowed to keep up to two horses each. The Proposed Project would fully develop and dedicate an 8.3-acre local park, as well as

dedicate land for and a 10.6-acre charter high school site and an 11.9-acre historical site surrounding the existing historic Montecito Ranch House. The Project would include renovation of the historic Montecito Ranch House. The historical site would include an equestrian staging/overflow parking area. The equestrian staging area would include several horse pens, an animal wash down area, hitching posts, an arena, a picnic area, and parking. These public facilities would be located within Unit 2. The Project also would include four Homeowners' Association (HOA) maintenance lots, totaling 7.9 acres. The vegetation within these lots would be maintained in accordance with the Fire Protection Plan for the Project in order to reduce the threat of fire within on-site canyons.

The Proposed Project would involve both on-site and off-site roadway improvements. Access to the Project site would be provided via: (1) Ash Street from Pine Street and (2) Montecito Way and Montecito Road from Main Street (SR 67). The Proposed Project would construct: (1) Montecito Ranch Road, connecting Ash Street at the eastern SPA boundary to Montecito Way at the southwestern SPA boundary; (2) local neighborhood streets (several private loop roads and cul-de-sacs); and (3) off-site street improvements to segments of Ash Street (west of Pine Street [SR 78]), Montecito Way (from Sonora Way to Montecito Road), and Montecito Road (from Montecito Way to Main Street [SR 67]). Off-site improvements to six intersections also are proposed, including Pine Street/Ash Street, Pine Street/Main Street, Main Street/Montecito Road, Montecito Way/Montecito Road, Highland Valley Road/Dye Road/SR 67, and Archie Moore Road/SR 67. Proposed improvements would entail road widening, restriping, signalization, and/or signal modification.

The Project would include a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to the County Circulation Element, as required by the County. Specific changes to the Circulation Element roadway and associated bicycle networks would be consistent with the County's proposed 2020 Circulation Element and would include:

1. Elimination of SA 603 between Pine Street and Rangeland Road.
2. Relocation of SA 330 between Sonora Way and Montecito Road to Montecito Way.
3. Revision of the road classification on Montecito Way between Sonora Way and Montecito Road from rural collector to rural light collector (refer to Table 1-3 for roadway standards).
4. Revision of the road classification on Montecito Road between Montecito Way and Main Street from rural collector to rural light collector.
5. Addition of SA 330 between Sonora Way and Pine Street (the new segment of SA 330 would include Montecito Ranch Road and Ash Street).
6. Realignment of SA 330 between Montecito Road and SR 67.

The existing Circulation Element of the Ramona Community Plan (RCP) identifies SA 603 (Cedar Street located to south of Ash Street) as a future major roadway between Pine Street and Bandy Canyon Road. The Ramona Community Planning Group has requested that SA 603 be removed from the Circulation Element. The Proposed Project would eliminate this "northern bypass" between Pine Street and Rangeland Road and replace it with a proposed realignment of SA 330 between Pine Street and SR 67, extending along Ash Street, Montecito Ranch Road and Montecito Way, including an extension of Montecito Way to SR 67. This modification would meet projected cumulative traffic demands with a lower capacity roadway.

The Proposed Project would require construction of off-site utility improvements to connect to public water service. Two 12-inch-diameter polyvinyl chloride (PVC) water transmission lines would be constructed off site completely within existing street rights-of-way. One pipeline would be constructed within Montecito Way from the southwestern portion of the SPA southerly to the existing main within Montecito Road. The other off-site water line would be constructed within Ash Street from the existing main within Pine Street westerly to the SPA boundary. An off-site potable water storage tank also would be constructed on an adjacent property just west of the Project site and would connect to a proposed pipeline within the development area. This tank would hold 1.26 million gallons under Wastewater Management Option 1 (see below) and 0.91 million gallons under Option 2. (The smaller tank would adequately accommodate water storage under Option 2 because the Project would have the benefit of using reclaimed water from an on-site WRF.)

The Proposed Project includes two wastewater management options; only one option would be selected. Since a final determination as to the most appropriate approach to treatment of Project wastewater has not yet been made, Wastewater Management Option 1, Off-site Sewer Connection, is addressed at the same level of detail as Wastewater Management Option 2, WRF, throughout this EIR.

Wastewater Management Option 1 would include the extension of a sewer force main off site to connect to an existing transmission line that flows to the Santa Maria Wastewater Treatment Plant (WTP). Wastewater management for the Project would be provided by RMWD. The Project site is located beyond RMWD's existing sewer service boundaries and sphere of influence and would require annexation into the RMWD and/or expansion of latent powers, which would require approval by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). RMWD has indicated that the Santa Maria WTP does not currently have sufficient capacity to serve the Proposed Project, but indicated that facilities could be made available to serve the Project within a five-year period if the Project Applicant would contribute funding for all facilities associated with expansion of the WTP, including administrative, design, and construction costs, as well as the cost of a percentage of the value of existing facilities. Proposed off-site sewer improvements would consist of a sewer force main from the southwestern corner of the Project site within Montecito Way, easterly on Montecito Road, and southerly on Kalbaugh Street (both paved and unpaved segments) to an existing sewer manhole and transmission line approximately 50 feet south of the terminus of Kalbaugh Street and north of Santa Maria Creek. The total length of this sewer force main would be approximately 9,000 feet (1.7 miles). The wastewater from the Proposed Project would be treated at the improved Santa Maria WTP. Under this option, a sewer pump station would be located at the equestrian staging/overflow parking area within the historic park site. The Project would dedicate 573.8 acres of open space under this scenario since no WRF would be required under Option 1.

Under Wastewater Management Option 2, all wastewater would flow toward the southwest corner of the Project site to the proposed on-site WRF. The WRF would have the capacity to serve only the Proposed Project and would be sized to treat up to 110,000 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater, which includes a 20 percent contingency factor. Proposed treatment buildings associated with the WRF would be located within a 0.9-acre area. A portion of the reclaimed water would be used on site for irrigation of public landscaped areas, and the remaining unused portion would be distributed over a proposed 16.9-acre spray field. Any excess treated wastewater would flow to five overflow storage ponds (6.9 acres total). Under this scenario, the Project would dedicate a total of 549.1 acres of open space on site.

Fuel modification zones would be provided in accordance with the Public Resources Code for Minimum Statewide Clearance of Brush, and generally would be 100 to 150 feet wide, depending on adjacency to high fuel threat vegetation. The fuel modification zones would consist of Zones A, B, and C. Zone A would be 100 feet wide around proposed structures and would consist of maintained and irrigated landscaping. Zone B would consist of the remaining width (up to 50 feet) in areas where the fuel management zone is greater than 100 feet. Zone B either would be cleared in conformance with Zone A or native vegetation within this zone would be thinned to 50 percent. Zone C would occur within the four HOA maintenance lots surrounding drainages adjacent to the proposed residential development. The purpose of Zone C is to slow and/or stop a fire that may follow the natural vegetation up the drainages and between proposed residential development areas. Zone C would not extend across the drainage located between the Unit 1 and 2 residential areas due to the requirement to avoid impacts to RPO wetlands and buffers. Native vegetation within Zone C would be thinned to 30 percent, and annual or weedy species would be trimmed to a height no greater than three inches. In addition, 10-foot-wide fuel modification zones, pursuant to the Consolidated Fire Code, would be provided on either side of roadways. Fuel modification zones along roadways would be cleared in conformance with Zone A. This would be consistent with the Wildland/Urban Interface Standards of the County Fire Code, which requires a minimum 100-foot-wide fuel modification zone from structures and a minimum of 10 feet of clearance on either side of roadways within the proposed right-of-way/limits of disturbance. Under Wastewater Management Option 2, the WRF would not require fire clearing due to the location and size of the storage ponds adjacent to open space. Additionally, no combustible structures greater than 250 s.f. would be located on the WRF site.

Project Setting

The Project site includes the 935.2-acre Montecito Ranch SPA, two areas adjacent to the SPA boundary (one northwest, the other northeast) and associated off-site road and utility improvements. The Proposed Project site is located in the rural community of Ramona in an unincorporated area of San Diego County within the County's Ramona Community Planning Area. The SPA is approximately one mile northwest of the Ramona Town Center. SR 78 borders the northern SPA boundary, while Montecito Way extends southerly from the southernmost SPA boundary. Cedar Street and Summer Glen Road are adjacent to the southern SPA boundary and Ash Street is adjacent to the eastern SPA boundary. Existing improvements within the SPA include dirt roads and the historic Montecito Ranch House. Several utility and road easements also are located within the SPA. A portion of the SPA previously has been used for cattle grazing and for farming of oat hay.

The Montecito Ranch SPA is generally characterized by a broad valley in the central portion with gently sloping terrain to the north. In addition, three distinct knolls are located on site: one in the northwestern portion of the site; one adjacent to the central northern Project site boundary; and one adjacent to the central southern Project site boundary. The gently sloping landform transitions to steeper topography associated with Clevenger Canyon, which is located immediately adjacent to the property to the northeast. The property is situated on a drainage divide, with the northward drainages emptying into Clevenger Canyon, and the gentle southwest draining canyons and valley flowing into the Santa Maria Valley. Elevations on site vary from a high of approximately 1,750 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) atop the knoll located along the central southern property boundary to a low of approximately 1,420 feet AMSL in the southwestern portion of the SPA.

The SPA contains a number of native plant communities, including southern coast live oak riparian forest, southern riparian scrub, disturbed wetlands, dense Engelmann oak woodland, open Engelmann

oak woodland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, southern mixed chaparral, and chamise chaparral. Many of the steeper areas support native vegetation, with the highest quality and least disturbance occurring in the northern portion of the Project site. In these areas, Diegan coastal sage scrub and southern mixed chaparral are the dominant vegetation communities. Oak woodlands occur in the northern and northeastern portions of the SPA. On-site non-native habitats include eucalyptus woodlands and non-native grasslands. Non-native grasslands can be found within the flatter portions of the property where historical farming and cattle grazing have altered the natural vegetation. Three man-made agricultural ponds occur on the property.

In 2002, portions of the Montecito Ranch SPA underwent agricultural farming. Much of the land disked had either been previously farmed, grazed, or was non-native grassland. During the 2002 disking activity, however, biological resources identified in 2001 (including Diegan coastal sage scrub, southern mixed chaparral, vernal pools, and disturbed wetland/seep) were impacted. These impacts have been addressed and mitigated through the Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) process, working with County and resource agency staff. As a result, a 220.5-acre area in the western portion of the Project site has been set aside to be dedicated as biological open space, and is not available as mitigation land for the Proposed Project. Although the Project would result in impacts to the previously disked area, because impacts to the habitat due to disking in 2002 have already been mitigated, Proposed Project impacts in this same area are not counted as new impacts in this EIR.

Project Objectives

The Proposed Project includes the following objectives:

1. Develop a consolidated residential project that is sensitive to the environment and the rural character of Ramona, and is an asset to the community and region.
2. Conserve the rural character and equestrian environment by preserving large contiguous open space and by dedicating community and regional trails.
3. Provide a range of for-sale, market rate, detached housing types to accommodate projected market needs for single-family houses.
4. Conserve, enhance, and protect natural resources within the Project site and areas of off-site improvements including the Ramona Grasslands, Santa Maria Creek and its tributaries, native vegetation, steep slopes, and major rock outcroppings.
5. Preserve the viewshed of the County Scenic Highway portion of SR 78.
6. Improve regional traffic congestion by creating a "loop road" system that would help minimize project traffic impacts to the Ramona Town Center.
7. Preserve and enhance the historic Montecito Ranch House as a historic park site.
8. Dedicate land for future community needs such as a charter high school and a park.
9. Develop a project that is visually attractive by including street-scene treatments, entry features, and a landscape palette that reflects the natural surrounding environment.

S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects

Table S-1, located at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of significant environmental impacts resulting from Project implementation. A subchapter reference is provided in the table, referring to the detailed EIR analysis for each significant impact. Table S-1 also includes mitigation measures to reduce and/or avoid the environmental effects, with a conclusion as to whether the impact has been mitigated to below a level of significance. Detailed analyses of significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the Proposed Project is implemented is provided in Chapter 2.0 of this EIR. Detailed analyses of significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project that can be mitigated are provided in Chapter 3.0 of this EIR. Explanations of those effects found not to be significant during preparation of the Initial Study and this EIR are provided in Chapter 4.0 with the full Initial Study provided in Appendix A. The mitigation measures listed in Table S-1 also are included at the end of this EIR in the List of Mitigation Measures and Environmental Design Considerations.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

Public comments were received on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this EIR during the 30-day review period. Twelve letters were received in response to the NOP. Comments reflecting concern or controversy regarding environmental issues requested that the EIR expand its discussion of Biological Resources, Transportation/Circulation, and Hazards (the NOP comment letters are included in Appendix A to this EIR).

Initially, the Proposed Project included an alternative circulation route from the Project site to Main Street. Montecito Ranch Road was proposed to connect with Ash Street at the eastern SPA boundary, traverse westerly through the SPA, and continue southwesterly and off site to Rangeland Road as SA 603. This route was rejected for several reasons. The route would adversely impact southern tarplant and the Ramona Grasslands, as well as additional Diegan coastal sage scrub. It also was assessed as growth inducing. In response to these concerns, the Project Applicant currently proposes the extension of Montecito Way (SA330) to Main Street, as discussed above.

Additional controversy occurred with regard to parklands on site. The RCP identifies a 30-acre neighborhood park with no stipulation that it would be developed. The Project Applicant proposed a smaller developed local park and a historic park. The 30-acre community park identified in the RCP was anticipated to serve 417 units in Montecito Ranch and 171 units in the Davis SPA. The Davis SPA was purchased by The Nature Conservancy for preservation in December 2005, reducing the potential demand for parkland in the area. After extensive negotiations with County staff an agreement was reached to allow for the smaller developed local park and a historic park, which would require a GPA.

Finally, the reader will note that Project-implemented installation of a traffic signal is proposed in Subchapter 2.1 of this EIR as mitigation for direct traffic effects at the intersection of SR 67/Archie Moore Road. A concern had been noted that line-of-sight along the state facility might be inadequate to support a signal at this location as it would be located at the apex of a horseshoe curve. Line of sight has carefully been reviewed at this location. Caltrans standards (which would control for this state route) require a sight-line 715 feet in length for a state route constructed at a 65 mile per hour (mph) design speed. This portion of SR 67 is posted at 55 mph. The line of sight, however, meets a 715-foot distance in both directions from the Archie Moore Road "T" intersection. As this distance

meets state requirements for the state route, implementation of a traffic signal upon confirmation of warrants would constitute appropriate mitigation.

S.4 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an EIR is an informational document intended to inform the public agency decision makers and the public of the significant effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects and describe reasonable alternatives to the Project. The lead agency (in this case the County of San Diego) must respond to each significant effect identified in this EIR by making findings for each significant effect. The issues to be resolved include whether or how to mitigate the associated significant effects, including whether to implement a project alternative or combination of alternatives. A statement of overriding considerations would be required due to significant unmitigable impacts associated with temporary air quality, as well as transportation/circulation.

The County also must decide whether or not to approve the requested GPAs with regard to the County Circulation Element and the Montecito Ranch SPA section of the RCP with regard to on-site parks. The GPA for the Circulation Element includes those stated above under S.1, Project Synopsis. As stated above, the RCP identifies a 30-acre neighborhood park be constructed for both Montecito Ranch SPA and Davis Ranch SPA. The Davis SPA was purchased by The Nature Conservancy for preservation, reducing the potential demand for parkland in the area. County staff has agreed to allow for the smaller developed local park and an historic park with a GPA.

Finally, the County must decide which wastewater management option would serve the Proposed Project. As stated above, the Proposed Project includes two wastewater management options, only one of which would be implemented. Option 1 is the extension of a sewer main that would connect off site to an existing facility approximately 50 feet south of the southern terminus of Kalbaugh Street, then flow to the Santa Maria WTP. Wastewater Management Option 2 is an on-site WRF to treat all on-site wastewater and utilize the reclaimed water to irrigate on-site public landscaped areas, as well as the private Homeowners' Association (HOA) areas. A separate Major Use Permit would be required for the WRF and will be processed prior to certification of the Final EIR.

S.5 Project Alternatives

Five Project alternatives have been identified for further analysis, including the No Project–No Development Alternative, No Project–Development Per Legal Parcels Alternative, Reduced Development Footprint Alternative, Reduced Density Alternative, and Closed Water System Alternative. These alternatives are evaluated in detail in Chapter 5.0 of this EIR, where environmental effects are compared to those of the Proposed Project and are assessed relative to their ability to meet the basic objectives of the Project.

No Project–No Development Alternative

This alternative evaluates the No Project–No Development Alternative, which assumes that the Project site continues in an undeveloped state over the long-term, with portions of the site under agricultural use. Under the No Project–No Development Alternative, the Project site would remain in its current condition of native and non-native habitats. The 617.1 acres of native habitat throughout the site would remain, as would agricultural support facilities and service roads. The

proposed residential Project would not be constructed, including supporting infrastructure (i.e., roadways and utilities connections), nor would the proposed charter high school site, local park site, equestrian staging area, or open space preserve areas be created. Additionally, the historic Montecito Ranch House would not be dedicated within a historic park site but would remain on site in its current condition.

The No Project–No Development Alternative is environmentally superior to the Proposed Project because it would avoid the near-term environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

No Project–Development Per Legal Parcels Alternative

The No Project–Development Per Legal Parcels Alternative assumes that the existing legal parcels within the Montecito Ranch planning area would gradually develop via a series of applications from separate property owners according to the existing zoning for the site. Based on existing zoning, this could result in development of an estimated maximum of 196 single-family residential units on minimum two- to four-acre lots, on a total of 637.7 acres. Dedication of a historic park site containing the Montecito Ranch House also would likely be required under this alternative. This alternative would not include a local park or charter high school site or equestrian staging area and would likely result in less on-site open space than the Proposed Project (i.e., 273.4 acres under this alternative versus a minimum of 549.1 acres under the Proposed Project). It is assumed that no off-site roadway improvements would be built as part of this alternative; each smaller development would likely pay a fair share toward the improvement of impacted roadways and intersections. The properties would use water wells and septic tanks.

The No Project–Development Per Legal Parcels Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives listed above, except the preservation of Montecito Ranch as an historical park site. This alternative generally would conform to the minimum lot sizes specified in the RCP and would result in slightly reduced impacts related to air quality, transportation/circulation, noise, and aesthetics, compared to the Proposed Project. Because of the larger lot sizes associated with this alternative, agricultural operations would be more likely to occur. The No Project–Development Per Legal Parcels Alternative would be expected to result in substantially greater impacts to biological resources and an increased likelihood of adverse impacts to cultural resources compared to the Proposed Project, however. Therefore, the No Project–Development Per Legal Parcels Alternative is not considered to be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project, based on its substantially greater impacts to biological and cultural resources.

Reduced Development Footprint Alternative

The Reduced Development Footprint Alternative would include 417 single-family residential units on minimum 10,000-s.f. lots. In addition, this alternative would retain the same park sites, charter high school site, equestrian staging area, and WRF (under Wastewater Management Option 2) as the Proposed Project. More open space would be provided under this alternative than under the Proposed Project. All off-site roadway and utility improvements under this alternative would be the same as those described for the Proposed Project.

The Reduced Development Footprint Alternative would be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project and would meet the Project objectives listed above. This is a feasible alternative that could be implemented by the Project Applicant, if it was determined by County decision makers to be the

preferred alternative. This alternative would result in similar impacts to air quality, transportation/circulation, land use, noise, and aesthetics as the Proposed Project, because each scenario proposes development of 417 residential units. Impacts to biological and cultural resources would be reduced under this alternative compared to the Proposed Project. These reduced impacts to cultural and biological resources would be the primary environmental benefits of this alternative. Although overall impacts under this alternative would be slightly less than the Proposed Project, the greater development densities associated with this alternative are generally not consistent with the surrounding residential development within Ramona.

Reduced Density Alternative

The Reduced Density Alternative would provide 244 single-family residential lots on minimum one-acre lots within the same residential development footprint as the Proposed Project. Open space areas under this alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project, except that there would be no dedication of a charter high school site, with this land instead being preserved as additional open space. Montecito Way would be widened between the project site and Montecito Road, and Ash Street would be widened between the project site and Pine Street. The widening of Montecito Road would not be required to support the traffic generated by this alternative. This alternative would require the same off-site utility improvements described above for the Proposed Project.

The Reduced Density Alternative would meet the Project objectives and would be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project. This alternative would result in reduced traffic generation, with associated reductions in long-term air quality impacts and traffic noise. Short-term construction-related air quality impacts and long-term cumulative impacts to the roadway network would remain significant and unmitigable. This alternative would result in similar impacts to land use and biological and cultural resources, compared to the Proposed Project. Because of the larger lot sizes associated with this alternative, non-commercial agricultural activities would be more likely to occur within residential parcels. Overall, this alternative would result in reduced environmental impacts and would be feasible to implement, but would not provide Proposed Project-related benefits such as the charter high school site and Montecito Road improvements.

Closed Water System Alternative

The Closed Water System Alternative design would be the same as the Proposed Project, except that the off-site water storage tank, and the associated pipeline and access road, would not be constructed. The water line connections to the Project site and the water booster pump station south of the Montecito Way/Montecito Road intersection still would be required, and the booster pump station would be expanded to include an underground holding/surge tank on the 10,000-square foot lot.

The Closed Water System Alternative would be environmentally superior to the Proposed Project and would meet the Project objectives listed above. This alternative would result in reduced impacts related to land use, cultural resources, and aesthetics. It would result in similar impacts to air quality, transportation/circulation and biology compared to the Proposed Project. Impacts due to noise would be slightly increased, because of the inclusion of the surge tank. Although overall impacts under this alternative would be slightly less than the Proposed Project, this alternative was not pursued as a part of the Project because the construction of a water storage tank is preferred by the Ramona Municipal Water District. The Project Applicant, however, is willing to implement this alternative, if it is determined to be acceptable to the water district and the County decision makers.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Although the No Project–No Development Alternative would result in minimal or substantially reduced environmental impacts, Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires identification of an alternative other than the No Project Alternative as the environmentally superior alternative. As such, the Reduced Density Alternative is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative for the overall Project.

Table S-1
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Significant and Unavoidable Impacts			
Transportation/Circulation (Subchapter 2.1)			
Direct Impacts			
2.1.3a	Significant direct impacts would occur to Pine Street between Ash Street and Main Street.	This impact would not be mitigated, because mitigation would include the widening of the roadway, which is infeasible.	Significant and unmitigated
2.1.3b	Significant direct impacts would occur to Main Street between Hunter Street and Poway Road.	This impact would not be mitigated, because mitigation would include the widening of the roadway, which is infeasible.	Significant and unmitigated
Cumulative Impacts			
2.1.4a, 2.1.4i	Significant cumulative impacts would occur to Pine Street/10th Street between Haverford Road and H Street.	This impact would not be mitigated, because mitigation would include the widening of the roadway, which is infeasible.	Significant and unmitigated
2.1.4b, 2.1.4j	Significant cumulative impacts would occur to Main Street between Pine Street and Poway Road.	This impact would not be mitigated, because mitigation would include the widening of the roadway, which is infeasible.	Significant and unmitigated
Air Quality (Subchapter 2.2)			
Project Level Impacts			
2.2.3a	Volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions during construction of the Proposed Project would be above the screen-level threshold.	This impact would not be mitigated, because mitigation would entail painting only one house per day, which is infeasible. In addition, implementation of this design consideration alone would not reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.	Significant and unmitigated (temporary)

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance			
Transportation/Circulation (Subchapter 2.1)			
Direct and Cumulative Impacts			
2.1.3c, 2.1.4c, 2.1.4k	Significant direct and cumulative impacts would occur to the intersection of Pine Street/Main Street.	• The Project Applicant shall restripe the northern leg of the intersection of Pine Street/Main Street to provide a southbound to westbound right-turn/through lane or an eastbound left-turn lane onto Main Street prior to occupancy of the 281st house and to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works (DPW). The Project Applicant also shall make a payment into the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program prior to the issuance of the first occupancy permit.	Less than significant
2.1.3d, 2.1.4d, 2.1.4l	Significant direct and cumulative impacts would occur to the intersection of Main Street/Montecito Road.	• The Project Applicant shall acquire right-of-way and widen and restripe the northern leg of the intersection of Main Street/Montecito Road to provide a westbound right-turn lane onto Main Street, as well as signal modification, prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit on site and to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW.	Less than significant
2.1.3e	Significant direct impacts would occur to the intersection of SR 67/Highland Valley Road/ Dye Road.	• The Project Applicant shall widen the intersection of SR 67/Highland Valley Road/Dye Road to provide dual northbound to westbound left-turn lanes prior to the occupancy of the 281st house on site and to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance			
Transportation/Circulation (Subchapter 2.1) (cont.)			
Direct and Cumulative Impacts (cont.)			
2.1.3f, 2.1.4f, 2.1.4n	Significant direct and cumulative impacts would occur to the intersection of Ash Street/Pine Street.	• The Project Applicant shall install a traffic signal at the intersection of Ash Street/Pine Street (once the County and Caltrans determine that warrants are met), and widen and restripe the intersection to provide an eastbound to southbound right-turn lane onto Pine Street and a southbound to westbound right-turn lane onto Ash Street prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit on site and to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW.	Less than significant
2.1.3g, 2.1.4g, 2.1.4o	Significant direct and cumulative impacts would occur to the intersection of Pine Street/Olive Street.	• The Project Applicant shall make a fair share contribution to the County of San Diego to be allocated toward the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Pine Street/Olive Street prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit on site and to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW. If the traffic signal is not installed by another entity prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit, the Project Applicant shall install a traffic signal.	Less than significant
2.1.3h, 2.1.4h, 2.1.4p	Significant direct and cumulative impacts would occur to the intersection of SR 67/Archie Moore Road.	• The Project Applicant shall install a three-way traffic signal (once the County and Caltrans determine that warrants are met) at the intersection of SR 67/Archie Moore Road prior to the occupancy of the 281st house on site and to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW. • The Applicant shall make a contribution into the TIF to mitigate cumulative impacts.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Transportation/Circulation (Subchapter 2.1) (cont.)			
Direct and Cumulative Impacts (cont.)			
2.1.4e, 2.1.4m	Significant cumulative impacts would occur to the intersection of SR 67/ Highland Valley Road/Dye Road.	• The Project Applicant shall make a fair-share contribution via payment into the TIF program prior to the occupancy of the 281st house on site.	Less than significant
2.1.4q	Significant cumulative impacts would occur to the intersection of SR 78/ Magnolia Avenue.	• The Project Applicant shall make a fair-share contribution via payment toward another project according to Board Policy J-25 or payment into the TIF program prior to occupancy of the 281st house on site. Required mitigation at this location includes the addition of one lane north of SR 78 for a distance of approximately 175 feet, plus a 90-foot transition.	Less than significant
2.1.4r	Significant cumulative impacts would occur to the intersection of Main Street/ 14th Street.	• The Project Applicant shall make a fair-share contribution via payment toward another project according to Board Policy J-25 or payment into the TIF program prior to occupancy of the 281st house on site. Required mitigation at this location may include a new northbound to eastbound right-turn lane, a minor signal modification, and curb returns at all corners.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Air Quality (Subchapter 2.2)			
Cumulative Impacts			
2.2.4a	Temporary cumulative VOC emissions during construction would be above the significance threshold.	• The Project will require 10 percent of the construction fleet to use any combination of diesel catalytic converters, diesel oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters, and/or California Air Resources Board (ARB) certified Tier I, II, or III equipment.	Less than significant
Land Use and Planning (Subchapter 3.1)			
Project Level Impacts			
3.1.3a	The Project would not be consistent with Condition 17 of the Community Character Element of the Ramona Community Plan (RCP), with regard to the water storage tank and its access road. Condition 17 states, "Grading shall be minimized. Streets, walkways, buildings, retaining walls, and other improvements should not modify the natural landforms."	• Mitigation for Significant Impacts 3.5.3b through f in Subchapter 3.5, Aesthetics, would reduce potentially significant land use impacts related to conformance with Condition 17 of the RCP Community Character Element and Residential Policy 5 of the RCP Land Use Element to below a level of significance. This measure includes installation of landscaping consisting of native species compatible with existing trees and vegetation cover around the proposed water storage tank and hydroseeding cut slopes along the proposed access road to the water tank with native seed mixes compatible with existing native species.	Less than significant
3.1.3b	The Project would not be consistent with Residential Policy 5 in the Land Use Element of the RCP, which states, "Ridgeline development should be discouraged. It should only be allowed if a viewshed analysis shows only minimal impact on adjacent properties and scenic roads identified in the Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan. County Road Standards in new subdivisions shall conform to the standards in the Ramona Design Review Manual to be prepared."	Same as Mitigation for Significant Impact No. 3.1.3a.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Land Use and Planning (Subchapter 3.1) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.1.3c	The Project would not be consistent with Policy 1 of the Noise Element of the RCP, which states, "Encourage land use and circulation patterns, which will minimize noise in residential neighborhoods," with regard to on-site residences along Montecito Ranch Road.	• Mitigation for Significant Impacts No. 3.3.3c and 3.3.3d, which includes establishment of a noise protection easement on site at a distance of approximately 500 feet from the centerline of Montecito Ranch Road, as identified in Subchapter 3.3, Noise, would reduce potentially significant land use plan impacts related to conformance with Policy 1 of the RCP Noise Element to below a level of significance.	Less than significant
3.1.3d	The Project would not be consistent with Policy 1 of the Noise Element of the RCP with regard to two off-site residences along Montecito Way.	• Mitigation for Significant Impact No. 3.3.3e in Subchapter 3.3, Noise, would reduce potentially significant land use plan impacts and significant community character impacts due to noise levels along Montecito Way to below a level of significance. This measure includes construction of noise walls or rubberized asphalt in front of the two houses that would be significantly affected by interior noise levels. Similarly, pursuant to Mitigation for Significant Impact No. 3.5.3a in Subchapter 3.5, Aesthetics, screening vegetation will be planted in front of the walls, which will reduce impacts to the existing community character of Montecito Way to less than significant levels.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Land Use and Planning (Subchapter 3.1) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.1.3e	Short-term community character impacts based on aesthetics along Montecito Way would occur.	• Mitigation for Significant Impact No. 3.5.3a in Subchapter 3.5, Aesthetics, would reduce significant short-term community character impacts to the Montecito Way viewshed to below a level of significance. This measure includes planting the sides of the roadway with trees and shrubs similar to those currently present along the roadway.	Less than significant
3.1.3f	Community character impacts based on interior noise levels at two residences along Montecito Way would occur.	Same as Mitigation for Significant Impact No. 3.1.3d.	Less than significant
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.2)			
Project Level Impacts			
3.2.3a	Direct on-site impacts to 0.93 acre of dense Engelmann oak woodland (including 0.14 acre of oak root zone) would occur.	• Direct impacts to 0.93 acre of on-site dense Engelmann oak woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through the preservation of 2.79 acres of dense Engelmann oak woodland within on-site dedicated open space. Although not required as mitigation, as part of Project design, an additional 9.88 acres of this habitat will be retained on site within dedicated open space.	Less than significant
3.2.3b	Direct on-site impacts to 0.39 acre of open Engelmann oak woodland (including 0.11 acre of oak root zone) would occur.	• Direct impacts to 0.39 acre of on-site open Engelmann oak woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through the preservation of 1.17 acres of open Engelmann oak woodland within on-site dedicated open space. Although not required as mitigation, as part of Project design, an additional 17.04 acres of this habitat will be retained on site within dedicated open space.	Less than significant
3.2.3c	Direct on-site impacts to 69.31 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub would occur.	• Direct impacts to 69.31 acres of on-site Diegan coastal sage scrub on site shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio through the preservation of 138.62 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub within on-site dedicated open space. Although not required as mitigation, as part of Project design, an additional 111.0 acres of this habitat will be retained on site within dedicated open space.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.2) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.2.3d	Direct on-site impacts to 123.27 acres of southern mixed chaparral would occur.	• Direct impacts to 123.27 acres of on-site southern mixed chaparral shall be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio through the preservation of 61.63 acres of southern mixed chaparral within on-site dedicated open space. Although not required as mitigation, as part of Project design, an additional 44.20 acres of this habitat will be retained on site within dedicated open space.	Less than significant
3.2.3e	Direct on-site impacts to 11.57 acres of chamise chaparral would occur.	• Direct impacts to 11.57 acres of on-site chamise chaparral shall be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio through the preservation of 5.78 acres of chamise chaparral within on-site dedicated open space. Although not required as mitigation, as part of Project design, an additional 7.85 acres of this habitat will be retained on site within dedicated open space.	Less than significant
3.2.3f	Under Wastewater Management Option 1 only: Direct on-site impacts to 26.85 acres of non-native grassland would occur.	Under Wastewater Management Option 1 only: • Direct impacts to 26.85 acres of on-site non-native grassland shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio through the preservation of 6.69 acres of non-native grassland within on-site dedicated open space and the purchase of 20.16 acres of non-native grassland in an approved mitigation bank or area approved by the Director of Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU). The 1:1 ratio accounts for a 0.5:1 mitigation ratio for impacts to non-native grassland habitat and an additional 0.5:1 mitigation ratio for impacts associated with the loss of raptor foraging lands in the Ramona Grasslands area. Although not required as mitigation, as part of Project design, an additional 16.68 acres of this habitat will be retained on site within dedicated open space.	Under Wastewater Management Option 1 only: Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.2) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.2.3f (cont.)	Under Wastewater Management Option 2 only: Direct on-site impacts to 27.61 acres of non-native grassland would occur. Under both Wastewater Management Options 1 and 2 only: If wetland impacts associated with off-site road and/or sewer improvements are mitigated for on the Project site, additional impacts to non-native grassland will occur.	Under Wastewater Management Option 2 only: • Direct impacts to 27.61 acres of on-site non-native grassland shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio through the preservation of 5.93 acres of non-native grassland within on-site dedicated open space and the purchase of 21.68 acres of non-native grassland in an approved mitigation bank or area approved by the Director of the DPLU. The 1:1 ratio accounts for a 0.5:1 mitigation ratio for impacts to non-native grassland habitat and an additional 0.5:1 mitigation ratio for impacts associated with the loss of raptor foraging lands in the Ramona Grasslands area. Although not required as mitigation, as part of Project design, an additional 16.68 acres of this habitat will be retained on site within dedicated open space. Under both Wastewater Management Options 1 and 2 only: • If wetland impacts associated with off-site road and/or sewer improvements are mitigated for on the Project site, additional impacts to non-native grassland will occur and will require mitigation. Mitigation for impacted non-native grassland will be required at a 2:1 ratio because the proposed mitigation site is already allocated for mitigation from previous impacts to the property. Specifically, direct impacts to 0.24 acre of non-native grassland shall require the preservation of 0.48 acre of non-native grassland.	Under Wastewater Management Option 2 only: Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.2) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.2.3f (cont.)		Sufficient land currently exists within the Project's vicinity to meet the required mitigation measures for impacts to non-native grasslands. Specifically, three privately owned, large parcels containing approximately 197 acres are located within the Ramona Grasslands. Smaller parcels also occur within the region.	
3.2.3g	Direct on-site impacts to 3,500 linear feet of Waters of the U.S., all of which is considered jurisdictional by CDFG and 300 linear feet of which is considered jurisdictional by the Corps, would occur.	• Prior to grading, sufficient evidence must be provided to the County Director of DPLU that all state and federal wetland permits have been obtained or that permits are not required. • Direct impacts to 3,500 linear feet of on-site jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. shall be mitigated by the preservation of the remaining Waters of the U.S. on site (approximately 19,215 linear feet).	Less than significant
3.2.3h	Direct on-site impacts to portions of occupied Diegan coastal sage scrub supporting two coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*) pairs would occur.	• Direct impacts to the coastal California gnatcatcher shall be mitigated by the preservation of 249.62 acres of suitable and occupied gnatcatcher habitat (Diegan coastal sage scrub) on site. • If Project grading, clearing, or construction activities are scheduled to begin during the breeding season for coastal California gnatcatcher (February 15 through August 30), surveys pursuant to USFWS protocol shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of the species in coastal sage scrub habitat within 300 feet of proposed activities. If it is determined that the species is absent, activities may proceed without restrictions. If the coastal California gnatcatcher is present, no grading, clearing, or construction activities shall be allowed between February 15 and August 30 within 300 feet of the habitat for this species or until the nest is vacated, as determined by a qualified biologist.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.2) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.2.3i	On-site reduction in foraging habitat for raptors would occur.	Same as Mitigation for Significant Impact No. 3.2.3f.	Less than significant
3.2.3j(a) and (b)	Indirect impacts to upland, riparian, and oak woodland habitats would occur within the Project site, due to increased chance of human encroachment by trail users.	• The following general mitigation measures shall be applied to the Proposed Project to protect the resources during construction: • The Project Applicant shall participate in a Landscape Maintenance District as the funding mechanism for the long-term management of open space. • Biological monitoring of clearing and grading shall be conducted as follows: o A biological monitor shall be hired by the Project Applicant prior to initiation of construction including staging, brushing, clearing, scraping, or any other ground-disturbance work. o The biological monitor shall attend any pre-construction meetings and provide the foreman with a map of areas considered sensitive and shall monitor construction activities in areas adjacent to sensitive habitat. o The biological monitor shall keep logs of construction activities and submit monthly monitoring reports to the County.	Less than significant
3.2.3k	Indirect impacts to sensitive plant species would occur due to trampling, illegal off-road vehicle use, erosion due to excessive stormwater runoff, and plant collection.		Less than significant
3.2.3l	Indirect impacts to sensitive wildlife would occur on site due to habitat fragmentation and impacts to on-site wildlife corridors.		Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.2) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.2.3m	Indirect impacts would occur to coastal California gnatcatcher due to removal of any Diegan coastal sage scrub during the gnatcatcher breeding season (February 15 through August 30) or any grading, clearing, or construction activities within 300 feet of an active gnatcatcher nest.	◦ Should work occur during bird breeding seasons (including coastal California gnatcatcher), noise monitoring shall be conducted by either an acoustical specialist or the biological monitor. ◦ If an impact occurs to a sensitive resource, the biological monitor shall have the ability to cease construction activity and shall notify the appropriate authority immediately. If construction is not ceased based on the monitor's direction, the monitor shall report the incident to the County inspector. • The limits of the sensitive habitat shall be flagged or fenced by a qualified biologist prior to grading to prevent inadvertent impacts to the habitat. • The population of approximately 75 individuals of delicate clarkia within the chamise chaparral habitat on the eastern side of the property, the population of approximately 2,340 individuals of southern tarplant, and, under Wastewater Management Option 1, the approximately 3 individuals of southern tarplant shall be flagged during construction to prevent encroachment.	Less than significant
3.2.3n	Indirect impacts would occur to raptors due to any grading, clearing, or construction within 300 feet of an active raptor nest during the raptor breeding season (February 15 and July 15).		Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.2) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.2.3j-n (cont.)		• If Project grading, clearing, or construction activities are scheduled to occur during the breeding season for raptors (February 15 through July 15), surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine the presence or absence of nesting raptors within 300 feet of proposed activities. If it is determined that nesting raptors are absent, activities may proceed without restrictions. If an active raptor nest is present, no grading, clearing, or construction activities shall be allowed between February 15 and July 15 within 300 feet of the active nest. • No trash, oil, parking, or other construction related activities shall be allowed outside the grading limits. • Prior to occupancy, a fence shall be installed to create a permanent barrier between residential yards and open space. The fence shall be a minimum of five feet in height and be of sufficient material to discourage trespassing into open space (Figure 3.2-10). • The Project shall implement the required RMP (REC 2008c; Appendix E) for the Proposed Project, including the following measures: • All open space for Units 1 and 2 shall be dedicated upon completion of Unit 1. • Selected areas along on-site trails shall be fenced with lodgepole fencing to provide direction and prevent encroachment into the open space (Figure 3.2-10). The on-site trails shall be posted with "off-limits" signs that also explain why the area should be avoided (Figure 3.2-11).	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.2) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.2.3j-n (cont.)		• The Project Applicant shall participate in a Landscape Maintenance District as the funding mechanism for the long-term management of open space. • Exotic plant species shall be removed from high quality woodlands, wetlands, and grasslands on an as-needed basis to be assessed every five years. • Sensitive plant population boundaries shall be mapped every three years. • Trash shall be removed from open space annually. • All habitats and sensitive plant and animal species shall be monitored annually. Biological surveys shall be conducted every five years for sensitive plant and animal species.	Less than significant
3.2.3o	Direct off-site impacts to 0.24 acre of off-site riparian woodland.	• Direct impacts to 0.24 acre of off-site riparian woodland shall be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through the creation of 0.24 (1:1 ratio) of riparian woodland and the preservation of 0.48 of riparian woodland, for a total of 0.72 acres. Mitigation shall occur within an approved mitigation bank or area approved by the Director of DPLU.	Less than significant
3.2.3p	Direct off-site impacts to 2.20 acres of off-site Diegan coastal sage scrub would occur.	• Direct impacts to 2.20 acres of off-site Diegan coastal sage scrub shall be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio through the preservation of 4.40 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub within on-site dedicated open space.	Less than significant
3.2.3q	Direct off-site impacts to 5.00 acres of off-site non-native grassland would occur.	• Direct impacts to 5.00 acres of off-site non-native grassland shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio through the purchase of 5.00 acres of non-native grassland in an approved mitigation bank or area approved by the Director of DPLU.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Biological Resources (Subchapter 3.2) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.2.3r	Direct off-site impacts to 2.10 acres of off-site agriculture/pasture land would occur.	• Direct impacts to 2.10 acres of off-site agriculture/pasture land shall be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio through the purchase of 2.10 acres of agriculture/pasture land in an approved mitigation bank or area approved by the Director of DPLU.	Less than significant
3.2.3s	Direct off-site impacts to 0.24 acre of CDFG, Corps, and RPO wetlands would occur.	• Direct impacts to off-site jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. shall be mitigated by the preservation of the remaining Waters of the U.S. on site (approximately 19,215 linear feet).	Less than significant
Cumulative Impacts			
3.2.4a	The Proposed Project would add to the regional cumulative loss of Diegan coastal sage scrub.	Same as Mitigation for Significant Impact No. 3.2.3c.	Less than significant
Noise (Subchapter 3.3)			
Project Level Impacts			
3.3.3a	Significant impacts may occur to residences closer than 300 feet from operating construction equipment.	• All construction equipment shall use properly operating mufflers. • All construction staging shall be performed as far as possible from occupied dwellings. • Anticipated heavy equipment operations for full workdays within 300 feet of any occupied dwelling shall require a noise control plan that either ensures that the residence is unoccupied during the workday or reduces the hours of allowable operation such that the 75 dB(A) CNEL noise standard is met. Alternatively, temporary, movable barriers could be utilized to mitigate noise impacts to residents adjacent to the proposed off-site road and utilities improvements.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Noise (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.3.3a	Significant impacts may occur to residences closer than 300 feet from operating construction equipment.	• All construction equipment shall use properly operating mufflers. • All construction staging shall be performed as far as possible from occupied dwellings. • Anticipated heavy equipment operations for full workdays within 300 feet of any occupied dwelling shall require a noise control plan that either ensures that the residence is unoccupied during the workday or reduces the hours of allowable operation such that the 75 dB(A) CNEL noise standard is met. Alternatively, temporary, movable barriers could be utilized to mitigate noise impacts to residents adjacent to the proposed off-site road and utilities improvements.	Less than significant
3.3.3b	There is the potential for significant temporary construction noise impacts upon residences located adjacent to the proposed off-site road and utilities improvements (i.e., along Ash Street, Pine Street, Montecito Way, Montecito Road, Kalbaugh Street, and several of the proposed intersection improvement areas).	Same as Mitigation for Significant Impact No. 3.3.3a.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Noise (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.3.3c	The construction of an estimated 88 Montecito Ranch homes along Montecito Ranch Road would occur within the anticipated 55 dB(A) CNEL contour (for both first and second stories).	• A six-foot high solid barrier shall be constructed on the southern property line of all Project lots that have backyards against Montecito Ranch Road. The barrier's weight must be at least 3.5 pounds per s.f. of face area and have no decorative cutouts or line-of-sight openings between the houses and Montecito Ranch Road. All gaps (except for weep holes) shall be filled with grout or caulking. The barrier may be constructed using one of the following alternative materials: (1) masonry block; (2) stucco veneer over wood framing (or foam core) or one-inch thick tongue and groove wood of sufficient weight per s.f.; (3) glass (0.25-inch thick) or other transparent material with sufficient weight per s.f.; (4) earthen berm; or (5) any combination of these construction materials. • On the Final Map, the Project Applicant shall grant to the County of San Diego a noise protection easement over the entire area of lots 1 through 8, 119, 120, 144, 145, 148 through 166, 235 through 244, 250 through 260, 268 through 275, 376, 377, 389 through 397, 398 through 400, and 412 through 425 inclusive of VTM 5020RPL[5]. This easement is for the mitigation of present and anticipated future noise levels on residential uses of the affected parcels. The easement shall require:	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Noise (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.3.3c (cont.)		Prior to the issuance of any building permit for any residential use within the noise protection easement, the Project Applicant shall: • Complete to the satisfaction of the Director of DPLU, an acoustical analysis performed by a County-approved acoustical engineer, demonstrating that the present and anticipated future noise levels for the interior and exterior of the residential dwelling will not exceed the allowable sound level limit of the Noise Element of the General Plan (60 dB[A] CNEL exterior and 45 dB[A] CNEL interior) and the RCP (55 dB[A] CNEL exterior). Future traffic noise level estimates for Montecito Ranch Road must utilize an LOS C traffic flow for a rural light collector road classification, which is the designated General Plan Circulation Element buildout roadway classification. • Incorporate to the satisfaction of the Director of DPLU all of the recommendations or mitigation measures of the acoustical analysis into the project design and building plans.	Less than significant
3.3.3d	Interior noise levels greater than 45 dB(A) CNEL would occur due to vehicular noise along Montecito Ranch Road.	Same as Mitigation for Significant Impact No. 3.3.3c.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Noise (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.3.3e	Interior noise levels greater than 45 dB(A) CNEL at two residences along Montecito Way would occur due to vehicular noise.	• Four-foot high solid noise walls shall be placed on private property in front of the two houses that would be significantly impacted by traffic noise (refer to Figure 3.3-2 for wall locations). If an agreement cannot be reached between the Applicant and the affected property owners, the noise walls shall be constructed within the right-of-way along Montecito Way or the roadway will be paved with rubberized asphalt in front of the homes and extending 300 feet north and south beyond the homes. If walls are constructed, the northernmost wall will be approximately 90 feet long and the southernmost wall will be 80 feet long. The barrier's weight must be at least 3.5 pounds per s.f. of face area and have no decorative cutouts or line-of-sight openings between the houses and Montecito Way. All gaps (except for weep holes) shall be filled with grout or caulking. The barrier may be constructed using one of the following alternative materials: (1) masonry block; (2) stucco veneer over wood framing (or foam core) or one-inch thick tongue and groove wood of sufficient weight per s.f.; (3) glass (0.25-inch thick) or other transparent material with sufficient weight per s.f.; (4) earthen berm; or (5) any combination of these construction materials.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Noise (Subchapter 3.3) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.3.3f	Sewer pump stations noise levels above 50 dB(A) CNEL would occur at residence property lines.	• The pump station emergency generators shall be located in a cinder-block building that utilizes acoustical louvers to decrease the noise level at the adjacent residential property lines. The louvers shall be placed on the vent openings on the northern side of the building. The sides of the building facing east, south, and west are required to be completely free of any openings or ventilation. • Once construction of the pump stations is completed and the pump stations are fully operational, a site-specific analysis shall be prepared to determine if additional measures are required to meet the property line noise standards. Any necessary additional measures shall be implemented.	Less than significant
3.3.3g	Water booster pump station noise levels above 50 dB(A) CNEL would occur at residence property lines.	• Prior to operation of the water booster pump station, a qualified acoustician shall verify that the emergency generator designs feature setbacks, quieter equipment, noise-attenuating enclosures, and/or reduced test times to prevent the daytime residential standard of 50 dB(A) L_{eq} from being exceeded.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4)			
Project Level Impacts			
3.4.3a	Direct impacts to site SDI-12,506, which is a CEQA-significant archaeological site, would occur.	• Direct impacts to site SDI-12,506 shall be mitigated by preparing and executing a data recovery plan for the site, which will include implementation of an approved research design plan, focusing on site mapping, diagnostic surface artifact collection, and subsurface data recovery excavation. The research design is included in the Archaeological Resources Review, Impact Assessment, and Preservation Plan (Appendix G) and shall include the following actions: • Field work shall be undertaken upon approval of the research design by DPLU archaeological staff. Field work also shall be coordinated with local Kumeyaay, who expressed an interest in the Project. The County shall identify a Kumeyaay representative to participate in the planning and implementation of the data recovery work to be undertaken at SDI-12,506. All field work, analysis, and report preparation will be completed under the direct supervision of a qualified archaeologist who meets County requirements or Secretary of the Interior Standards. • A phased approach shall occur for the data recovery excavations. Phase I shall complete a total of 40 shovel test pits and 10 square meters of test excavation. Phase II shall focus on high density artifact areas and possible feature areas and shall complete up to an additional 10 square meters of excavation. All soils shall be passed through 1/8-inch screen. • All prehistoric cultural materials shall be bagged with provenience and saved for analysis. Fire-affected rock and non-diagnostic historic materials shall be noted but not saved, unless they need to be included in materials submitted for special analyses. Appropriate documentation shall be completed.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.4.3a (cont.)		• The debitage analysis shall focus on identifying stage-of-reduction technology information. Stone material type also shall be recorded. Attributes of diagnostic flake type, flake size, and amount of cortex present shall be identified. • Ground stone artifacts shall be described by type (mano, pestle, metate, etc.), material type, presence of shaping or battering, number of faces, and condition. • Ceramics shall be quantified by weight and analysis focused on identifying manufacture technology, characterizing clay fabric, identifying use attributes, and determining vessel form, if possible. Most sherds shall be broken to examine the interior fabric and all rim sherds shall be examined for diagnostic characteristics. • Animal and reptile bones will be analyzed separately by faunal analyst Susan Arter Mayer of the San Diego Natural History Museum. • If recovered, up to 3 samples shall be submitted for radiocarbon dating, up to 5 samples shall be submitted for obsidian sourcing and hydration analysis, and up to 10 pottery samples shall be submitted for thin section analysis. If appropriate, samples shall be submitted for soil pollen analyses and tool pollen and protein residue studies.	

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.4.3a (cont.)		• The results of the excavations and analysis will be presented in a report following the guidelines established by the Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format prepared by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Appropriate photographs, maps, and drawings will be included as well as data catalogs and results of special studies. All cultural materials recovered during the data recovery mitigation phase will be combined with the materials recovered during the test phase and will be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to the San Diego Archaeological Center, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.	
3.4.3b	Potential impacts to unknown CEQA- and/or RPO-significant cultural sites buried within the Project site may occur during on-site grading activities.	• Direct impacts to buried, previously unrecorded, cultural resources would be mitigated through the execution of a grading monitoring program. The program would include the following requirements: Implement a grading monitoring and data recovery program to mitigate potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources on the Montecito Ranch property (SP01-001, TM5250RPL, Log No. 01-09-013) to the satisfaction of the DPLU Director. This program shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following actions: • Provide evidence to DPLU that an adequate number of County-approved archaeologists has been contracted to implement a grading monitoring and data recovery program to the satisfaction of the DPLU Director. A letter from the Principal Investigator shall be submitted to the DPLU Director.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.4.3b (cont.)		• The Project Archaeologist shall contract with an adequate number of Native American monitors to be involved with the grading monitoring program as outlined in the County of San Diego Report Format and Content Guidelines (2006). • The County-approved archaeologist(s)/historian(s) and Native American monitor(s) shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program as outlined in the County of San Diego Report Format and Content Guidelines (2006). • The consulting archaeologist(s) shall monitor all areas identified for development including off-site improvements. • During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor(s) and Native American monitor(s) shall be on site full-time to perform full-time monitoring as determined by the Principal Investigator of the excavations. The frequency of inspections will depend on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. Monitoring of cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the Principal Investigator. • Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field and the monitored grading can proceed.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.4.3b (cont.)		• In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the Project Archaeologist shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of discovery. The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the County Archaeologist, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The County Archaeologist must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the consulting archaeologist and approved by the County Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods. • If any human bones are discovered, the Principal Investigator shall contact the County Coroner. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains. The Principal Investigator shall follow up with the County Coroner and NAHC to ensure that these steps have been completed.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.4.3b (cont.)		• Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the artifacts shall be recovered and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The Principal Investigator shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis. • In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, all cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid. • In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, a report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the DPLU Director prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report will include Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms. • In the event that no cultural resources are discovered, a brief letter to that effect shall be sent to DPLU by the Project Archaeologist stating that the grading monitoring activities have been completed and were negative.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.4.3c	Potential impacts to unknown but potential subsurface cultural resources beneath the proposed equestrian staging area may occur.	• Test excavations shall be completed prior to construction of the equestrian improvements to confirm the surface assessment that no cultural resources are located in the area. If resources are discovered, the above procedures listed in Mitigation for Significant Impact No. 3.4.3b would be implemented to ensure proper handling of such resources.	Less than significant
3.4.3d	Indirect impacts to the Montecito Ranch House and its visual setting over time may be significant, depending of the ultimate use of the Ranch House.	The Montecito Ranch Historic Complex (SDI-12,476H) shall be preserved and maintained by the County or cooperating group. • Funds for the management and maintenance of the Montecito Ranch House shall be procured through the LMD. Preservation and maintenance measures for the Ranch House are presented in the Historical Resources Review, Impact Assessment, and Preservation Plan for the Montecito Ranch House Complex (Heritage Resources 2008c). • The Proposed Project shall ensure that the historic buildings will be used in a manner consistent with their historic character and maintained in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards and Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings" and the California State Historic Building Code. (These standards provide general guidelines for necessary repairs and upgrades, such as reuse of existing historic fabric and replacement of historic fabric in like kind. In addition, the California State Historic Building Code provides methods to maintain historic integrity while providing necessary structural stabilization or accessibility improvements.)	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.4.3d (cont.)		• Any ground disturbing activities, such as landscape and/or hardscape installation, utility upgrades, driveway improvements, or equestrian facility improvements shall be reviewed for potential impacts by a qualified archaeologist who meets Secretary of the Interior Standards. The archaeologist would make avoidance or impact mitigation recommendations, in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Archaeological Documentation, which could include archaeological excavations guided by an archaeological research design and implemented by the qualified archaeologist. The Project Applicant shall prepare and submit to the County Historic Site Board an application for Landmark Designation in accordance with Ordinance 9493 (Local Register of Historical Resources adopted August 14, 2002) for the Montecito Ranch House and surrounding landscape that is described in the Historical Resources Review, Impact Assessment, and Preservation Plan for the Montecito Ranch House Complex prepared by Heritage Resources dated October 17, 2007. The County Historic Site Board shall examine the Montecito Ranch House and make a recommendation to the Director of DPLU, who shall review the nomination for Landmark Designation and make a decision whether the resource is eligible for Historic Designation in accordance with Ordinance 9493.	

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			

3.4.3e	Potential indirect impacts to the 13 remaining cultural sites (SDI-12,473, SDI-12,474, SDI-12,475, SDI-12,480, SDI-12,481, SDI-12,484H, SDI-12,486, SDI-12,489, SDI-12,494/9901, SDI-12,496, SDI-12,497, SDI-12,498, and P-37-024282) may occur due to vandalism.	• The remaining 13 archaeological sites shall be placed within dedicated open space and shall be monitored throughout the development process. It is anticipated that the dense native vegetation on site will adequately protect these sites from vandalism. Allowable ground disturbing activities shall be limited to archaeological excavations guided by an archaeological research design approved by the County of San Diego. Any proposed archaeological research program should include provision for curation of collections and records.
		• The required RMP for the Montecito Ranch development shall be prepared and shall include, in addition to the above measures, the following:
		  • To ensure that no inadvertent impacts to archaeological sites occur post-construction, the following activities shall not be allowed within 100 feet of any archaeological site boundary: brush clearing, vegetation thinning, future trail development, or use of any type of mechanical equipment in the event of a brush fire or for any other purpose.
		  • Active measures for protection will be implemented as development proceeds, including rustic fencing to be placed periodically along road and trail alignments to protect natural and cultural resources.
		  • Interpretive signage shall be placed at trailheads (not in specific resource locations) to advise trail users of the cultural sensitivity of the area as well as the legal penalties for resource disturbance.
		  • As plans develop for the active management of the Montecito Ranch House, provisions shall be made for the County or cooperating group to provide periodic open space protection monitoring. An agency archaeologist should provide scheduled monitoring of archaeological sites. If volunteers are sponsored
			Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.4.3e (cont.)		and supervised by a qualified archaeological association or individual who can ensure confidentiality for archaeological site locations, the cooperating group can also provide archaeological site monitoring for specific locations. One remaining prehistoric/historic site in the southwest portion of the property lies primarily in open grassland and will require more active protection measures. Because it is visible from the Ranch House, this site shall be monitored by County staff or the cooperating group who manages the Ranch House complex. Yearly inspections shall be completed to ensure that no inadvertent impacts or intentional artifact collecting is occurring.	Less than significant
3.4.3f	Potential impacts to unknown CEQA- and/or RPO-significant cultural sites buried within off-site improvement alignments may occur during grading activities.	• Direct impacts to buried, previously unrecorded, cultural resources for off-site improvements would be mitigated through the execution of a grading monitoring program. A qualified cultural resource monitor shall be present during grading for proposed off-site roadway and utility improvements, including along Montecito Way in the vicinity of previously recorded sites and where surface visibility was poor during the survey, as discussed under Mitigation for Significant Impact No. 3.4.3b and the Archaeological Resources Review, Impact Assessment, and Preservation Plan (Appendix G), to prevent impacts to any unknown resources (including buried resources).	Less than significant
3.4.3g	Potential indirect impacts to the rural setting along Montecito Way may occur.	• Because of the potential for indirect impacts to the rural setting along the existing segment of Montecito Way, mitigation in the form of appropriate right-of-way improvements (i.e., historically appropriate fencing and/or landscaping) along this roadway segment shall be implemented to complement the setting to the satisfaction of the Director of DPLU.	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Cultural Resources (Subchapter 3.4) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.4.3h	Impacts to the Montecito Road Bridge, including modification or removal, may occur.	• The Montecito Road Bridge shall be recorded on DPR 523 Resource Record Forms, including appropriate photographs and drawings as documentation.	Less than significant
Aesthetics (Subchapter 3.5)			
Project Level Impacts			
3.5.3a	Short-term visual impacts along Montecito Way would be substantially different, as landscaping would be sparse, the scale would be much smaller compared to current conditions, and the pavement width would be approximately doubled.	• Following improvements to Montecito Way, the sides of the roadway would be planted with trees and shrubs similar to what is currently present along the roadway. Trees will be planted with 24-inch container boxes and are anticipated to initially be approximately 12 to 15 feet in height. The trees have a growth rate of up to three feet per year. Tree species will include, but not be limited to eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* spp.), Brisbane box tree (*Tristania converta*), coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), and California pepper (*Schinus molle*). Trees will be spaced randomly along the roadway approximately every 30 to 40 feet. Shrubs will be used to screen the understory of the trees. Shrubs will be planted from five-gallon containers and would grow up to approximately two feet per year. Scrub species will include, but not be limited to, toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*), manzanita (*Arctostaphylos* spp.), agave (*Agave* spp.), and lantana (*Lantana* sp.).	Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Aesthetics (Subchapter 3.5) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.5.3b	The off-site water storage tank would substantially disrupt the existing visual continuity.	• Landscaping consisting of native species compatible with existing trees and vegetation cover shall be provided around the proposed water storage tank. • Cut slopes required for the water tank access road shall be hydroseeded with native seed mixes compatible with existing native species.	Less than significant
3.5.3c	Grading required for the access road associated with the water storage tank would result in change to the visual character that would disrupt the existing continuity.		Less than significant
3.5.3d	The project would not be consistent with Condition 17 of the Community Character Element of the Ramona Community Plan (RCP). Condition 17 states, "Grading shall be minimized. Streets, walkways, buildings, retaining walls, and other improvements should not modify the natural landforms."		Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

Table S-1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS*			
Impact No.	**Impact**	**Mitigation**	**Significance After Mitigation**
Impacts Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (cont.)			
Aesthetics (Subchapter 3.5) (cont.)			
Project Level Impacts (cont.)			
3.5.3e	The project would not be consistent with Residential Policy 5 in the Land Use Element of the RCP. Residential Policy 5 states, "Ridgeline development should be discouraged. It should only be allowed if a viewshed analysis shows only minimal impact on adjacent properties and scenic roads identified in the Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan. County Road Standards in new subdivisions shall conform to the standards in the Ramona Design Review Manual to be prepared."		Less than significant
3.5.3f	Landform alteration impacts associated with the grading of the off-site access road to the proposed water storage tank would be significant.		Less than significant

* All impacts and mitigation measures apply to both wastewater management options, unless otherwise noted.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK